

STEPHEN OFFUTT

New Directions in Transformational Development

Abstract

How does theology and theory inform evangelical international development initiatives? The present article answers this question by reviewing the creation and growth of the international development industry, by outlining the dominant theory in evangelical development today, and by pointing to possible future directions. It argues that Transformational Development, currently the dominant evangelical development paradigm, has played a critical role in evangelical development theory and practice. But there are weaknesses to the theory. New voices, especially Wesleyan voices, are needed to shape evangelicalism's response to poverty in the 21st century.

Key Words: transformational, holistic, poverty, evangelical, international development

Stephen Offutt is assistant professor of development studies at Asbury Theological Seminary in Wilmore, Kentucky.

Introduction

Evangelicals have long been committed to Christian development. Well over 70 international evangelical Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are based in the United States alone. They include such household names as Compassion International, the Salvation Army, Samaritan's Purse, World Vision, and World Relief. Collectively, evangelical NGOs work on every continent and in every region of the world, from Argentina to Siberia, and from Vietnam to Angola. The scale of work that evangelical NGOs perform is impressive. World Vision's budget in 2003 was \$513 million (Wuthnow 2009). The resources provided to such organizations by evangelicals sitting in pews across America are considerable. In 2001, U.S. Protestant churches contributed \$3.7 billion to overseas ministries (Wuthnow & Offutt 2008). Without a doubt, these organizational vehicles for evangelical outreach are present in the utter most parts of the earth, and they are busily working to transform the world for Christ and His Kingdom.

But what exactly do evangelical NGOs do in all these places, and how is it related to missionary work? More importantly, how did all of this get started, and what are the theological and theoretical principles on which they operate? The present article attempts to answer some of these questions. It notes that Transformational Development is the dominant paradigm in the evangelical development community. Transformational Development, which coalesced in the 1990s after several decades of incubation, presents a Christ-centered perspective of development. It has helped to orient evangelical development work around the world.

There are, however, indications that other evangelical development theories can and should be developed. The world has changed since the 1990s, as has our knowledge about issues related to international development. What possibilities exist in the evangelical world that might help it keep pace? This article points to promising ways in which the Wesleyan community might contribute to these issues. First, though, a brief overview of what international development is, and the evangelical community's place in it, is necessary.

The Beginnings of Modern International Development

Since at least the time of John Wesley, Westerners have struggled to understand the changes wrought by industrialization, urbanization, global trading systems, and other aspects of international social, political and economic structures. Scholars struggled to articulate what was happening to the world around them, and began referring to their contemporary society as 'the modern world'. They distinguished this from 'the traditional world', or societies that had not been industrialized, urbanized, or democratized.

Such scholars viewed the break between ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’ societies to be among the most important divides in human history.

By the beginning of the twentieth century it had become clear that the advantages of modernization were tremendous. Humanity advanced on the strength of scientific and technological innovations that touched every element of life. As a result, the West’s capacity to generate wealth and extend life set them apart from any other civilization in history. In everyday life, this meant that solving basic problems, like finding potable water, curing illnesses, and transporting people and things quickly and over great distances, had never been done more effectively.

There was a seamy underside to such advances. Industrialization brought horrendous working conditions to factory workers. It tore at the social fabric of some communities, as new economic activities and commitments changed the rhythm of family relationships. The atomization of society left the modern individual lonely and insecure. But the alternative to these social ills was, as Thomas Hobbes observed, a life that was nasty, brutish and short. The modern world, with all its promise and progress, still appeared to be the better option.

The processes of modernization primarily shaped Western countries until well into the era of the World Wars. There were colonial incursions and missionary activities around world, but they did not result in the creation of modern societies. After World War II, however, a new, bi-polar world order, revolving around the United States and the Soviet Union, would begin to extend modernity in new directions. In the West, the rebuilding of Europe came first. The 1944 Bretton Woods Conference established a framework for financial and commercial relations between non-Soviet Block countries. It also created five new multilateral institutions, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. The IMF in particular was intended to work closely with the Marshall Plan as Western powers rebuilt Europe. Indeed, most initiatives in this era were intended to strengthen and integrate Western societies on both sides of the Atlantic (Lairson & Skidmore 2002).

Three trends, however, allowed the focus to fairly quickly shift away from Europe and toward the Global South and East. First, the Cold War drew increasing attention to countries on the periphery of the new world order, such as Korea. Second, Western policy makers and academic elites became aware of the benefits that might be accrued by helping other countries and cultures to modernize. Finally, soldiers who fought in World War II’s African and Asian theaters, as well as in the Korean War came back with tales of grinding poverty and a motivation to help those caught in such misery. A number of evangelical NGOs were founded for precisely this reason. It was thus that both at the government and at the grass roots

level, the U.S. and other Western countries began to develop the rationale and the tools necessary for engaging in international development. 'International development' became nearly synonymous with 'modernization' (Balaam & Dillman 2011).

In the 1950s and 1960s, modernization theories were hammered out in America's finest universities and then converted into templates for U.S. engagement in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Walt Rostow was a central figure in these developments. As a professor of Economic History at MIT in the 1950s, Rostow developed a theory outlining how traditional societies could be ushered into the modern world by passing through stages of economic growth. Such growth, Rostow argued, needed to be accompanied by political democracy, infrastructural improvements, and technological advances. In 1960, Rostow joined the Kennedy Administration. In 1961 The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) was founded, as was the United States Peace Corps. Both institutions were intended to serve U.S. interests by helping impoverished societies become modern, democratic nation states. Fledgling modern democracies, it was assumed, would choose to align themselves with the West in the Cold War context (Balaam & Dillman 2011).

Most modernization projects did not, however, go according to plan. Stages of economic growth outlined in a textbook were not easily mapped onto societies that were often characterized by conflict, corruption, and oppression. The term 'mis-development' crept into the vocabulary of aid workers and development scholars, and it seemed that many developing countries were simply trading in one form of poverty for another. In the 1970s and 1980s, economic and political crises became the norm across entire regions, and dependency on Western aid to sustain whatever advances were achieved became far too common.

Scholars and practitioners thus began to cast about for new models and interpretations of development — an intellectual project that continues unabated today. An early theory that competed most directly with modernization theory was dependency theory. It posited that Western countries represented the core of the global system, and countries in the Global South and East constituted the periphery. In this view, resources flow from periphery countries to core countries, enriching the latter at the expense of the former. Again from this perspective, the Bretton Woods System thus served as a way to oppress and to impoverish most African, Asian and Latin American countries, while making North American and Western European countries rich. Modernization theorists took exception to these ideas, and the two theories served as the poles of debates on international development for decades.

In the midst of academic debate and, more importantly, deep civil conflict and strife, religious actors in developing countries also felt compelled to make sense of what was happening in their world. This was nowhere more true than in Latin America, where civil wars, state sponsored violence, military coups, hyperinflation, and failing industries created misery and despair. The most prominent religious response to this state of affairs came out of the Catholic Church, and quickly came to be known as liberation theology. Some of its primary architects were Gustavo Gutierrez (1973) and Leonardo Boff (1978). The 1968 Latin American Episcopal Conference in Medellin, Colombia was a critical moment for liberation theology's wider acceptance by Catholic leaders. Liberation theology was, and is, a theology that is employed as both a reflection on a social context and as an instrument in its alteration (Wolterstorff 1983). Because of this latter element and its particular application in Latin America, those who taught liberation theology also helped to channel people into various armed resistance movements throughout the region.

Rapid evangelical expansion in the Global South and East was just beginning in the 1960s and 1970s. Most new converts in these decades were poor and marginalized. Religious persecution added to the social, political and economic challenges they faced. Evangelicals viewed their world through the lens of their faith, and instinctively tried to make theological sense of the violence and misery to which they were subjected, or which they witnessed on a daily basis. Most evangelicals in Latin America who were educated enough to read Liberation theology found it to be at odds with how they read the Scriptures. One reason was that evangelicalism and Pentecostalism in particular, had a pacifist bent at that time. But if liberation theology was not the answer, then how were evangelicals to respond? It is in their approach to this question that the beginnings of the Transformational Development paradigm can be found.

In 1974 evangelical leaders from around the globe gathered for the Lausanne Congress in Switzerland. Because of the questions their local contexts had forced upon them, Latin American participants, particularly Rene Padilla and Samuel Escobar, were leading advocates of what eventually became Article Five in the Lausanne Covenant, which is perhaps the most important evangelical document of the twentieth century (Escobar 2011). In it, Article Five outlines the evangelical stance on Christian Social Responsibility. It highlights the importance of loving our neighbor, ideas of reconciliation, and the belief that evangelism and socio-political activity are not mutually exclusive. The themes embedded in its Article Five became the platform for the construction of Transformational Development.

The Lausanne Congress also internationalized the effort to develop an authentic theory of evangelical development. Important contributors from

the mid-1970s on emerged from India, including Jayakumar Christian and Vinay Samuel. North American evangelical scholars and development practitioners, such as Wayne Bragg, Ron Sider, and perhaps somewhat unintentionally, Nicholas Wolterstorff, helped to push this theoretical project forward. South African missiologist David Bosch also had a role to play, as did World Vision, which provided critical institutional support (Myers 1999). A host of other actors and institutions were involved, and the dialogues that helped to birth Transformational Development took place at conferences in the West and in local communities where evangelical NGOs were working across the world. The essence of these conversations was captured and refined in a single work by Bryant Myers called *Walking with the Poor: Principles and Practices of Transformational Development*, published in 1999. This is the capstone work of the Transformational Development theory.

The Transformational Development Paradigm: A relational understanding of poverty

There are three basic components to the Transformational development paradigm. First, Transformational Development defines poverty as broken relationships. It highlights fractured relationships with God, with oneself, with others, and with Creation as being the primary categories of poverty. Second, Transformational Development defines development as the restoration of all these relationships. If development is the tonic to poverty, and poverty is defined as broken relationships, then the logical understanding of development is healing those relationships. Third, the ultimate goal of transformational development is to live in Shalom. States Wolterstorff: “Shalom is the human being at peace with all his or her relationships: with God, with self, with fellows, and with nature,” (Wolterstorff 1983, 69). The Transformational Development trajectory thus runs coherently from a state of broken relationships, poverty, to a state of restored relationships, or shalom.

Poverty as broken relationships

Transformational Development clearly does not hold to traditional, economic definitions of poverty. Perhaps the most common measure of poverty in the United States is based on income level and/or the net worth of individuals or family units. The global corollary to this way of thinking is to consider poverty as scarcity, or as lacking basic goods. These specifically economic orientations to poverty have their place, but they miss spiritual and social types of impoverishment that are important to Transformational Development.

Transformational Development’s definition of poverty falls more closely in line with theories that also take poverty’s social nature into account. One

such theory posits that poverty is constituted by ‘un-freedoms’ or by the limited capacities of individuals (Sen 2000). Other theories argue that poverty is coterminous with lack of access to social power (Friedman 1992), or that those who are impoverished live in a trap of weakness, isolation, powerlessness, and vulnerability (Chambers 1992). Transformational Development owes an intellectual debt to some of these theories, but pushes into new territory by casting a theory of poverty that more fully engages the evangelical worldview.

Jayakumar Christian’s (1994; 1999) understanding of poverty as disempowerment became particularly formative for Transformational Development. Christian demonstrated that multiple and overlapping systems work to disempower the poor. These include social, psychological, cultural, and spiritual systems, all of which keep the poor in captivity. Christian also focused on relationships between the poor and the non-poor, asserting that the non-poor are ensnared by god complexes that make them think they have both the ability and the right to play god in the lives of the poor. This has the effect of spiritually impoverishing the non-poor, and socially and economically impoverishing the poor.

Myers (1999) built upon Christian’s conceptions of poverty. He Christian’s focus on relationships central to his own interpretation, but moved away from (although did not negate) Christian’s language of captivity. Myers opted instead for the language of brokenness. States Myers: “Poverty is a result of relationships that do not work, that are not just, that are not for life, that are not harmonious or enjoyable. Poverty is the absence of shalom in all its meanings,” (Myers 1999, 86). This relationship based approach to poverty is a hallmark of Transformational Development. By focusing on relationships, issues of economic scarcity, of justice, and of the link (or lack thereof) humans have with God can all be incorporated into our understanding of poverty.

Development as the restoration of broken relationships

If poverty is defined as broken relationships, then development can be perceived as the restoration of those relationships. Transformational development focuses on four relational areas. The first has to do with humanity’s relationship with the Triune God. Meyers argues that accepting God’s invitation to be reconciled to Him through Christ’s work on the cross is the “transformational point of maximum leverage for change,” (Myers 1999, 118). Without the restoration of this relationship, the opportunities for other kinds of transformation are far more limited.

The second relationship that must be restored is the human’s relationship with himself or herself. One area of concern in this respect is self-esteem. People need to be able to be at peace with who they are, and to be able to

process their own identity and actions honestly and truthfully. Recovery from psychological trauma can be part of this dynamic. But Myers is also concerned about issues of personal integrity, the depth of one's character, and the instillation of values within the individual. This is the stuff of Christian spiritual and personal formation.

The third category to which Myers points is relationships with other people. Communities and societies are often divided along ethnic, racial, class, or religious lines. When frictions exist along social fault lines of any kind, creating positive change can be difficult. The same also holds true when interpersonal dynamics are fractured. Transformational Development asserts that part of positive change must be the healing of these relationships. National, group, or local reconciliation efforts are thus a constitutive element of development – they are the most direct way to move from poverty to shalom in the area of human relationships.

The final relational area which requires restoration is the interaction of humans with creation. Stewardship principles are reinforced in Transformational Development. The paradigm takes into account that the global economy is increasing its consumption of nonrenewable resources. Water shortages are a problem of increasing numbers of people, many of whom live in politically unstable environments. Fisheries, wooded areas, and farmland are mismanaged on a regular basis. It is clear that humans are out of kilter with their environment, and some evangelicals argue that there is a spiritual component to this damaged relationship (Bamford and March 1987; Sleeth 2006). It is clear that poor stewardship keeps people materially poor and in conflict with one another. Shalom is hindered at multiple levels by environmental degradation.

By mending relationships in these four areas, Transformational Development hopes to change the *people* embedded in these relationships. Transformational Development's concern for people highlights issues of identity, dignity and vocation. Transformational Development shares these concerns with a larger family of development theories that also focus on people (Korten 1987; 1990), and which gained acceptance in the late 1980s and 1990s. These theories also focused on grassroots economic and ecological sustainability, as well as active democratic and civic participation. People-centered approaches can be contrasted with earlier theories of modernization and dependency, which focused more heavily on (sometimes global) social, economic and political systems.

Transformational Development's End Goal: Shalom

The relational and people centered orientation of Transformational Development is intentionally teleological in nature, and its ultimate and

explicit goal is to bring people and communities into shalom. Nicholas Wolterstorff (1983) argued that shalom can be best understood by using the same four relational categories that were later employed by Myers (1999) to understand development: communion with God, with oneself, with others, and with creation. Wolterstorff (1983) further argued that shalom means more than the absence of hostility or brokenness within these categories. Rather, it is the highest form of *enjoyment* in all four of these relationships. Wolterstorff stated that “to dwell in shalom is to enjoy living before God, to enjoy living in one’s physical surroundings, to enjoy living with one’s fellows, to enjoy life with oneself,” (Wolterstorff 1983, 70).

Peace is not necessarily synonymous with Transformational Development’s conception of shalom. Peace is sometimes obtained in the presence of material scarcity and injustice. Shalom is not. “A nation may be at peace with its neighbors and yet be miserable in its poverty,” (Wolterstorff 1983, 69). Shalom also cannot be obtained “in an unjust situation by managing to get all concerned to feel content with their lot in life,” (Wolterstorff 1983, 71). Justice is thus “indispensable to shalom... because shalom is an *ethical* community,” (Wolterstorff 1983, 71). Two tasks of development, then, are to bring people into relationships that are wholesome and edifying, and to help communities meet their basic physical needs. The tasks of development and definitions of shalom extend beyond this, but both hold a central place in Transformational Development.

Like the definitions of poverty and development, shalom creates a distinction between Transformational Development and secular development theories. Some overlap does exist: secular development often seeks to create longer life spans, higher levels of wealth, lower mortality rates, less polluted and more robust ecosystems, and better functioning economies and government systems. None of the items just listed are anathema to shalom. In fact, Wolterstorff argues that such developments, which are often aided by the use of technology, “bring shalom nearer”. But what is often absent in such goals is the objective of enabling people to better love themselves and their and neighbors. What is always absent from secular development goals is a reconciliation of humans to God through His Son Jesus Christ. Love of neighbor and a relationship with Christ are, on the other hand, essential for the Judeo Christian concept of shalom.

Critiques of Transformational Development

Transformational Development is the evangelical world’s most rigorous and cohesive development paradigm. It has set the development agenda for many evangelical NGOs, and it has provided a coherent, alternative development theory that helps distinguish evangelical development efforts from those of their secular counterparts. Its ability to frame and direct

Christian initiatives against poverty into productive actions has benefited communities all over the world.

But Transformational Development does have weaknesses. One is readily recognizable by practitioners of Transformational Development: no one can point to a single community that has ever reached the stated goal of living in shalom. Broken relationships are part of the human condition. Sin is a reality that has not yet been overcome. No matter how well designed a development project is, no matter how skilled development practitioners are, and no matter how much innovation and creativeness community participants demonstrate, the fullness of shalom is never achieved. A rejoinder to this complaint might be that shalom is an aspiration, it is not intended as an attainable goal. This is no doubt true, but such an approach creates problems in the field. How do development practitioners know when they are close enough to shalom to stop working in a given community? What metrics of evaluation work when goals are unattainable? And what development practitioners themselves can claim to live in shalom? The point here is that at a practical level, aspirations are often less useful than attainable objectives.

There are also theoretical tensions in the Transformational Development paradigm. The idea, for example, of making the restoration of relationships central to development is problematic because most academicians accept the premise that modernization atomizes society. It breaks down relationships that are found in traditional societies. Ferdinand Tönnies perhaps most famously articulates this problem by pointing out the differences between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. According to Tönnies (1935), traditional societies (*Gemeinschaft*) are characterized by family and kinship relationships. Modern societies (*Gesellschaft*) are predominated by legal or contractual relationships. Such relationships are based on rationality and calculation rather than more secure networks that are granted to an individual at birth. Tönnies states that “the theory of the *Gesellschaft* deals with the artificial construction of an aggregate of human beings which superficially resembles the *Gemeinschaft* insofar as the individuals live and dwell together peacefully. However, in *Gemeinschaft* they remain essentially united in spite of all separating factors, whereas in *Gesellschaft* they are essentially separated in spite of all uniting factors,” (Tönnies 1935 in Tilman 2004, 585). Other scholars, including Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Thorstein Veblen, reinforce Tönnies’ claim that modern societies embrace the rise of the individual at the expense of communal bonds. Modernization, then, works against one of Transformational Development’s core concepts.

If Transformational Development rejected modernization, this would not be a problem. But the reverse is clearly true: projects done within the Transformational Development rubric often help community members pass

from traditional societies into the modern, globalizing world around them. Many shared goals of secular development and transformational development have already been referenced; many more could be listed. Transformational Development may be distinct from other contemporary theories of development, but it is also intellectually informed by them. If, then, the social theorists just mentioned are right about atomization in modern societies, then the modernizing processes touched off by Transformational Development projects run in exactly the opposite direction of shalom.

New Directions

The two problems just mentioned – one practical and one theoretical – serve simply as illustrations that as helpful as Transformational Development has been, significant improvements can be made. The intellectual project of elaborating evangelical development theories is far from over. In fact, Bryant Myers himself has openly questioned why other theories have not been brought forward in the decade and more that has passed since his own book was published. A new generation of evangelicals should be responding to a new set of global realities (Myers 2012). The time has surely come for new work to be done.

Voices from a Wesleyan perspective could be invaluable in this regard. The great majority of contributors to date have a strong Reformed background. This is true of Myers, Padilla, and Wolterstorff, to name just a few. Tim Tennent, President of Asbury Theological Seminary, has argued that we could be on the cusp of the “Wesleyan moment” in Global Christianity. A Wesleyan theology of development could be a valuable plank to this larger platform, which could contribute at the theoretical, social and practical levels.

The Theological and the Theoretical

Even without formally engaging in Christian development conversations, some Wesleyan scholarship flows immediately into evangelical theories of development. Howard Snyder (2011a), a pre-eminent Wesleyan scholar, outlined eight Wesleyan themes in his recent book. He did so with no formal interest in development theory. And yet at least four of the themes he mentioned directly engage the current evangelical development dialogue. These include Wesley’s love for the poor, salvation as the restoration of God’s image, a renewed missional church, and the restoration of all creation. It is worth providing a brief explanation of each of Snyder’s points.

- *Wesley’s love for the poor*: Snyder quoted Wesley as saying “I love the poor... If I might choose, I would still, as I have done hitherto, *preach the Gospel to the poor*,” (2011a, 22). Snyder further points out

that Wesley, and Methodist missionary J Waskom Pickett after him, believed that God's saving grace proceeds from the least to the greatest, not the other way around. Snyder thus claims that "to be Wesleyan means to see the world through the eyes of the poor and to help incarnate the Good News among and with the poor," (2011a, 22)

- *Salvation as the Restoration of God's Image:* Snyder stated forthrightly that "Jesus Christ is the perfect living, loving image of God, and salvation is the restoration of that image," (2011a, 25). Snyder further pointed out that the image of God is social and relational, so that "salvation means the restoration of true community," (2011a, 26). True community is a reference to Wesley's understanding of social holiness, which according to Snyder, is also closely linked to the concept of shalom.
- *A Renewed Missional Church:* Snyder argues that one of Wesley's great longings was to see the Church of England become vitalized such that it would transform England and the world. Snyder describes a renewed church as one which "is marked by a potent combination of worship, evangelism, loving discipleship, and a witness of justice and mercy in the world," (2011a, 30).
- *The Restoration of all Creation:* Snyder pointed out that "... Wesley increasingly emphasized salvation as the healing of the whole created order," (2011a, 31). Snyder references several of Wesley's sermons, including ones called "The New Creation," "The General Deliverance," and "The General Spread of the Gospel". Snyder concludes by stating that "seeing the world in a Wesleyan way, then, means living in the hope of the restoration of all creation—and understanding that our present sufferings somehow play a necessary part in our own contribution to the kingdom of God in its fullness," (2011a, 35).

In another recent work, Snyder (2011b) discussed the need to heal the fourfold alienation that sin has created. The four alienations Snyder lists corresponds directly with Wolterstorff's articulation of shalom and Myers' conceptualization of poverty. Snyder wrote that we need to be reconciled with God, with ourselves, with others, and with the Earth. Snyder belabored this last point, stating that it "is an essential part of the textured ecology of creation and redemption. All other dimensions of reconciliation through Jesus Christ are impoverished if we miss the biblical accent on the earth," (Snyder 2011b, 150).

Each of these points directly engages themes within the Transformational Development paradigm. Wesley's concern for the poor, and his celebration of the love God has for them, provide a natural, unforced segue from a delineation of Wesleyan teachings directly into issues of development. This

segue is reinforced by all of the practical ministries Wesley undertook. Wesley's commitment to seeing the church, both local and universal, as the social institution for restoration fits in well with current conceptions of church based Christian development. Major overlapping concerns of Snyder's writing and the Christian development dialogue include the restoration of human relationships, the aspiration of shalom, and the concern for the environment.

The Social and the Ecclesiological

A second and related reason that Wesleyanism is positioned to become a significant contributor to theories of evangelical development is the connection between John Wesley and the global Pentecostal movement. British sociologist David Martin, perhaps the foremost authority in the world on global Pentecostalism, argued that the roots of the movement are found in 18th century Methodism, which itself was a cultural revolution that "escaped the social and ecclesiastical hierarchies linked to territory, to automatic belonging, and to state power" (2002, 7). Contemporary global Pentecostalism is also a cultural revolution. "In almost every respect Pentecostalism replicated Methodism; in its entrepreneurship and adaptability, lay participation and enthusiasm, and in its splintering and fractiousness," (Martin 2002, 8). One could thus argue that Wesley's Aldersgate experience and subsequent ministry activities are once again being played out in the Pentecostal communities of Peru, Zambia, the Philippines and elsewhere.

This Wesleyan heritage is important because Pentecostal evangelicalism is one of the world's fastest growing religious movements. By even modest estimates, there are there are a quarter of a billion Pentecostals worldwide (Martin 2002) and their most explosive rates of growth are found in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In Latin America, for instance, 64 million evangelicals are creating a new religious pluralism in the region (Allen 2006). In Africa, adherents of the Christian faith grew from 30 million in 1945 to an estimated 380 million in 2005 (Carpenter 2005). What Wesley and Pickett found to be theologically correct also turns out to be sociologically accurate: such growth began at the margins of societies across the Global South (Offutt 2010). While many of these new centers of evangelicalism now have socioeconomically diverse faith communities, there is no doubt that the majority of their members are still poor.

Although their Wesleyan lineage is clear to academicians, it is likely that most contemporary evangelical Pentecostals are themselves unaware of the linkages. Still, there is a likely elective affinity between contemporary Pentecostal theologies in the new global centers of Christianity and Wesleyanism. A Wesleyan inspired Christian theory of development could create strong points of practical and scholarly engagement with these potential partners.

Interestingly, these faith communities have instinctively understood that they should care about the poor (Miller & Yamamori 2006). Much could be gained if such instincts were synthesized with a thoughtful, global, Wesleyan theological discourse on principle of development.

A global conversation that includes Wesleyan scholars and evangelical Pentecostals in the Global South could find new ways to answer existing theoretical issues. For example, a resolution to the above mentioned theoretical problem that modernization creates for the relationship-based Transformational Development paradigm begins to emerge from global Pentecostalism's ecclesiological tendencies. Martin (2002) argued that converts of Pentecostalism do leave traditional forms of relationships through conversion and enter into new kinds of relationships. But he frames this move as an escape from oppressive, hierarchical relationships to relationships that are based on more egalitarian principles. In the Latin American context, "the shift from [Catholicism] to [Pentecostalism] is not a simple switch of denomination but a tearing of the social fabric, since people move out of a web of embedded relationships and choose to belong to a group of fictive brothers and sisters based on a shared moral ethos," (2002, 23). Martin thus does not entirely negate Tonnies' claim, but shows that when people exiting traditional societies do so to enter religious communities, a moral ethos can hold them in communities not envisioned by Tonnies and his contemporaries. Such communities could be the centerpiece of a Wesleyan vision of evangelical development.

The Practical

A Wesleyan Christian development discourse that is global in nature could also open the way for ministry and development partnerships. In the 1970s and 1980s, there were fewer citizens of the Global South who had the tools to engage in development work. Today, that is not the case. New strategies of Christian development must acknowledge this new empirical reality. They must be based on a partnership model not only within communities, as much development practice already attempts, but local Christian leaders and professionals must also be brought into the conversation. If partnerships constructed in ways that mirror the egalitarian impulses of evangelical communities, then a global community with some of shalom's characteristics will begin to take shape. If stakeholders at multiple levels are brought into development initiatives, they are much more likely to succeed in local communities. People in multiple sectors can thus benefit from proper application of Wesleyan principles of partnership.

Conclusion

Globalization is a much talked about phenomenon. In some respects, it is bringing modernization to countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America for the first time. In China, industrialization has lifted 440 million people out of poverty in the last quarter century. Wages, though, are low, and the air in China's industrial parks can become so polluted that it is dangerous to breathe (*The Economist* 2012). Similar images can be conjured up in many other developing countries. Similar images might also be conjured up of 18th century Britain.

While great strides against poverty are being made, much more is calling out to be done. Those who follow in the Wesleyan tradition of responding to such a call might most profitably do so with their intellectual gifts. They might develop an authentically Christian, Wesleyan, theory of development.

Bibliography

- Allen, John. 2006. "Evangelical Strength in Latin America is Homegrown." *National Catholic Reporter*.
- Balaam, David & Bradford Dillman. 2011. *Introduction to International Political Economy*. Fifth Edition. New York: Longman.
- Bamford, Christopher and William March. 1987. *Celtic Christianity: Ecology and Holiness*. Great Barrington, MA: Lindisfarne Press.
- Boff, Leonardo. 1978. *Jesus Christ Liberator: A Critical Christology for Our Time*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Chambers, Robert. 1997. *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Carpenter, Joel. 2005. "Foreword." In *The Changing Face of Christianity: Africa, the West, and the World*. Eds. Lamin Sanneh & Joel Carpenter. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Christian, Jayakumar. 1999. *God of the Empty-Handed: Poverty, Power and the Kingdom of God*. Monrovia, CA: MARC. (Based on Dissertation completed in 1994.)
- The Economist*. 2012. "Banyon. Having it Both Ways." January 28, 2012 Edition.
- Escobar, Samuel. 2011. Plenary Speech at conference hosted by the Center for Applied Christian Ethics. Wheaton College. Wheaton, IL.
- Friedman, John. 1992. *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Gutierrez, Gustavo. 1973. *A Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Korten, David 1987. *Community Management: Asian Experience and Perspectives*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- _____. 1990. *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global*

- Agenda*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- Lairson & Skidmore. 2002. *International Political Economy: The Struggle for Power and Wealth*. Third Edition. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Martin, David. 2002. *Pentecostalism: The World Their Parish*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Miller, Donald & Tetsunao Yamamori. 2007. *Global Pentecostalism*
- Myers, Bryant. 1999. *Walking with the Poor: Principles and Practices of Transformational Development*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- _____. 2012. Address to the annual Accord Network meeting hosted in Baltimore, MD.
- Offutt, Stephen. 2010. "The Transnational Location of Leading Evangelical Churches in the Global South." *Pneuma: The Journal for the Society of Pentecostal Studies* 32(3): 390-411.
- Sen, Amartya. 2000. *Development as Freedom*. Anchor Books.
- Sleeth, Matthew. 2006. *Serve God, Save the Planet: A Christian Call to Action*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Snyder, Howard. 2011a. *Yes in Christ: Wesleyan Reflections on Gospel, Mission, and Culture*. Toronto: Clements Academic.
- _____. 2011b. *Salvation Means Creation Healed: The Theology of Sin and Grace*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- Tilman, Rick. 2004. "Ferdinand Tönnies, Thorstein Veblen and Karl Marx: from community to society and back?" *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 11:4, 579-606.
- Tönnies, Ferdinand. 1935 (1887). *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. Leipzig: Hans Buske Verlag. Eighth revised edition, translated into English by CP Loomis as *Community and Society – Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1957.
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas. 1983. *Until Justice and Peace Embrace*. Grand Rapids, MI: William Eerdmans Publishing.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 2009. *Boundless Faith: The Global Reach of American Churches*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wuthnow, Robert and Stephen Offutt. 2008. "Transnational Religious Connections." *Sociology of Religion* 69:209-232.